



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,414	08/21/2003	Rolf Beckers	A35457-I-070256.0227	7759
21003	7590	09/26/2005	EXAMINER	
BAKER & BOTTS 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			NGUYEN, TAI T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2632	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,414

Applicant(s)

BECKERS ET AL.

Examiner

Tai T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claim 5 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Kuenzel (EP 0707293). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rolf (DE 3910514 A1) in view of Brunius et al. (US 6,114,955) and Kuenzel (EP 0707293).

Regarding claim 1, Rolf discloses a security system (figure 2) for monitoring danger parameters comprising at least one danger sensor (14) and a central unit (32) connected to the at least one sensor, wherein the at least one danger sensor has a communication module (23) having uniform dimensions and shape for different types, and wherein the communication module includes means (24, 25) for attaching the danger sensor to a mounting plate (10, figure 1, see entire document). Rolf discloses the instant claimed invention except for the central unit being wirelessly connected to the danger sensor. Brunious et al. teach a sensor system (figure 1) having a sensor

(18) coupled to a wireless transmitter (14) and a central unit (22) wirelessly connected to the sensor (figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the wireless transmitter as taught by Brunius et al. in the system as disclosed by Rolf for the purpose of wirelessly transmitting a sensed signal to a remote location.

Rolf, as modified, further fails to disclose a straight guide with means for preventing removal, and wherein the at least one danger sensor is attached to the mounting plate by directing the sensor into the straight guide in a vertical direction. Kuenzel teaches an infrared motion detector module (12) mounted onto a base unit (14), wherein the module has a cover with guide tracks on the inner surface that locate with guide profiles on the base as the module is moved into engagement with a socket (20, see abstract). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the guide tracks with a locking means the as taught by Kuenzel in the system as disclosed by Rolf, as modified, for the purpose of guiding the sensor into the base with the locking means therein in order to prevent removal therefrom.

Regarding claim 2, Rolf discloses the communication module (23) being designed for connection of a detection module (14) for danger parameters, the detection module being provided for different danger parameters and which can be connected to any communication module (figure 1).

Regarding claim 3, Rolf discloses the mounting plate (10) is installed at prescription point, and the danger sensor is attached to the mounting plate by means (24) of the corresponding communication module (23, figure 2).

Regarding claim 4, Rolf discloses the instant claimed invention except for means associated with the communication module for protecting the danger sensor against unauthorized removal. Since Rolf discloses the danger sensor (14) being connected to the communication module by means (12, 25). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use protection means for the purpose of locking those two modules together in order to prevent any removal/stolen therefrom.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Black (US 4,248,981).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am-5:00pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tai T. Nguyen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Tai T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2632

September 22, 2005